

No new matter is added.

Rejections

Claims 1-10, 14-15 and 18-19 stand rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. 6,342,907 ("Petty"). Claims 11-13, 16-17 and 20 stand rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Petty in view of DevDaily.com (<http://www.devdaily.com/java/edu/vc/vc010003/>)(DevShed) , which bears a copyright mark of 1998.

These rejections are rendered moot by the above amendments, but Applicants are not conceding that the rejections have merit. Nevertheless, Applicants note the following differences between the present subject matter and the references of record.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method, claim 14 to a computer system, and claim 18 to a computer program product. The independent claims are amended to recite that the first panel is not web-based, and that the second panel, to which field attributes are converted, is web-based. Moreover, the claims mention the corresponding computer systems (called "first" and "second") that respective panels belong to. Accordingly, the first panel is converted from the first type to the second type.

Petty and DevShed are taken as characterized in earlier responses. As Applicants have pointed out before, Petty and DevShed do not disclose the "first type of panel" of the present claims, because the first type of panel:

- (a) is not web-based;
- (b) belongs to the "first computer system" according to the claim; and
- (c) has "a configuration table ... tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system".

Accordingly, the conversion between first and second panel types recited in the independent claims is not disclosed or suggested by the references. Dependent claims add further features to this subject matter. It therefore cannot be said that claims 1-20 as amended are anticipated or rendered obvious by the references.

Conclusion

Favorable consideration of claims 1-20 as amended is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Weddeling et al
Serial No. : 10/686,008
Filed : October 15, 2003
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 16104-011001 / 2003P00622
US

Please apply \$130 and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2009

/j richard soderberg reg. no. 43,352/
J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60514326.doc